SOME NEW BOOKS.

The Jewish Encyclopædia.

Those who inspect the second volume of *The Jewish Encyclopædia* (Funk & Wagnalls Co.) will find in it confirmation of the general approval commanded by its predecessor. In a notice of the initial volume we pointed out the principles on which the work was to be compiled. There has been no material departure from those principles on the part of the editors in the volume before us, and the judgment, discretion, literary efficiency and learning exhibited by the contributors deserve high commendation. The subjects here treated begin with "Apocrypha" and end with "Benash," the name of a Cabalist of the early part of the eighteenth century. Among the many topics of interest to non-Jewish readers, we would direct particular attention to those discussed under such headings as "Apostacy," "Aramaic," "Arabia," "Aragon," "Arianism," and "Barcelona," "Aristotle in Jewish Literature," "Assyria" and "Babylonia," "Astrology" and "Astronomy," "Auto da Fé," "Badges," and, finally, "The Beautiful in Jewish Literature."

I.

A great deal of research is embodied in the article entitled "Apostacy and Apostates" from Judaism, by Dr. Gottheil and Dr. Kohler. The authors point out that the terms which we have quoted, which, of course, are taken directly from the Greek, are used in I. Maccabees, the Septuagint and Josephus to designate desertion and deserters from the faith of Israel. The apostacy of the high priest Jason, to which reference is made in II. Maccabees, filled the Jewish people with horror and hatred, and his fate served as a warning to others. The outspoken hostility of the Syrians, however, under the Seleucid monarchy to the law of the God of Israel proved less dangerous to the Jewish people than the allurements offered in Alexandria by Greek philosophy and, subsequently, by Roman pomp and power. In this city there was evolved a tendency to break away from ancient Jewish customs and to take a wider view of life. Grätz, in his "History of the Jews," maintains that the third book of the Maccabees was written for the purpose of protesting against the many examples of apostacy presented at Alexandria in the time of Caligula. The destruction of the Temple by Titus not only increased the followers of Pauline Christianity, but gave gnostic sects an opportunity of winning adherents among discouraged Jews. When the last efforts at rebuilding the Temple and the Jewish state ended in disaster and in the persecution of the Jews who observed the Mosaic Law, many of the new Christian converts from Judaism became informers against their brethren, in order to insinuate themselves into the favor of the Romans.

As a typical apostate, who, from being a great expounder of the law, had become an open transgressor, a teacher of false doctrines and a seducer or betrayer of his coreligionists, the Talmud singles out Elisha ben Abuyah, known as Aher, "changed into another one." His Gnosticism made him a determined antagonist of the law at the very time when Roman persecution tested Jewish loyalty to the utmost. On the whole, however, the relations between the apostates and the faithful observers of the law remained tolerably good until the fourth century A. D., when the Christian Church, having become preponderant in the Roman State, directed the zeal of her converts against their former brethren. While the Synagogue was prohibited from admitting proselytes, all possible honors were conferred upon Jews that joined the Church. An apostate, Joseph by name, a former member of the Sanhedrin of Tiberias, was raised to the dignity of a "Comes" by the Emperor Constantine, in reward for his apostacy. That many Jews abjured their faith only to escape the penalties prescribed for transgressions of the Jewish law is inferable from a decree of the Emperor Arcadius, demanding an investigation of each applicant for admission into the Church as to his moral and social standing. In the Byzantine Empire under Leo the Isaurian, an attempt was made forcibly to convert the Jews, and many of them became outwardly Christians, while secretly observing the Jewish rites. It is pointed out in the article before us that to none of these was the term apostate applicable in the strict sense of the word. Neither would it be correct to enumerate in the list of apostates those Jews of Spain, France and other countries who at one time or another dropped many Talmudic statutes, but later returned to the fold, having meanwhile remained followers of the law of Moses. The name apostate became a term of bitter reproach when baptized Jews used their power to malign and injure their former brethren. It is an interesting, but not, perhaps, surprising fact that many of the most rigorous Spanish Inquisitors were descendants of converted Jews.

Toward Islam from the outset the Jews took an attitude somewhat different from that which they adopted toward Christianity. It is well known that a number of the Jews in Medina were among the first converts made by the Prophet himself. The Jews, while they rejected Mohammed's claim to prophecy, agreed with him in the fundamentals of his faith. In the twelfth century many enlightened Jews joined Islam, owing partly, as Grätz thinks, to the degeneracy which Eastern Judaism had experienced, and partly to the wonderful success attained by the Arabs in becoming a world power. When the Moslem fanatics known as Almohades (Unitarians) swept over Fez and southern Spain, no choice was left to most of the Jews but the adoption of Islam or death. Many of them, consequently, submitted to outward conversion. Unlike the apostates to Christianity, the apostates to Islam exhibited no great animosity toward their former brethren. The reason for this difference of temper is undoubtedly to be found in the comparative tolerance, which as a rule, Mohammedans had shown to the Jews.

II.

What was the relation of the Aramaic tongue to the Hebrew language and literature? This question is examined in the book before us by Dr. W. Bacher, Professor at the Jewish Theological Seminary in Budapest, but a consideration of the Aramaic versions of the Bible is reserved for the third volume of this Encyclopedia. Prof. Bacher points out that, of all Semitic languages the Aramaic is most closely related to the Hebrew, and forms with it, and possibly with the Assyrian, the northern group of Semitic lenguages. In spite of this affinity Aramaic was regarded by the ancient Hebrews as a foreign tongue; and a hundred years before the Babylonian Exile, it was understood only by people of culture in Jerusalem. Aramaic, nevertheless, was destined to become Israel's vernacular tongue, but, before this could come about, it was necessary that the national independence should be destroyed, and that considerable sections of the people should be removed from their homes in Palestine. How long the process of Aramaization lasted is not known, but about the year 300 B. C., Aramaic makes its appearance in Jewish literature.

The author of Chronicles uses a source in which not only documents concerning the history of the Second Temple are reproduced in the original Aramaic, but the connecting narrative itself is written in Aramaic. In the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, the author of the Book of Daniel begins his narrative in Hebrew, but, when he introduces the Babylonian sages and scholars as speaking Aramaic to the King, he continues his history in Aramaic. The employment of the two languages in these Bibical books would of itself indicate that the circles in which and for which the documents were written were bi-lingual. Prof. Backer recalls the fact that, in the time of the Second Temple both languages were in common use in Palestine: the Hebrew in the academies and in the circles of the learned, the Aramaic among the lower classes, in the intercourse of daily life. The Aramaic continued to spread, and became the customary popular idiom, though not to the complete exclusion of the Hebrew. Even in those fields, however, where Hebrew remained the dominant tongue, it was deeply influenced by Aramaic. Prof. Bacher has no doubt that it was in Aramaic that Josephus wrote his book on the "Jewish War," before he wrote it in Greek. That Josephus used the Aramaic is pronounced evident from the reason he assigns, namely, that he desired to make the first attempt intelligible to the Parthians, Babylonians, Arabs, the Jews living beyond the Euphrates and the inhabitants of Adiabene. The oldest literary monument of the Aramaization of Israel would be the Targum, the Aramaic version of the Scriptures, were it not that this received its final revision in a somewhat later age. According to Prof. Bacher, it could not have been long after Ezra's day that the necessity made itself felt for the supplementing of the public reading of the Hebrew text of Scripture in the synagogue by a translation of it into the Aramaic vernacular. Just as the translation of the Scripture lesson for the benefit of the people assembled in the synagogue had to be in Aramaic, so all addresses and homilies hinging upon the Scripture had to be in the same language. Thus Jesus and his nearest disciples spoke Aramaic and taught in it, although, probably, they were also conversant to a certain extent with Greek.

When the Second Temple was destroyed and the last remains of their national independence had perished, the Jews in Palestine and Babylonia had become almost completely an Aramaic-speaking people. A small section of the Jews spoke Greek habitually, and in the Arabian peninsula there were Jewish tribes that spoke Arabic, but the former tended to succumb to Christianity, and the latter, in the end, to Islam. Aramaic was the language of that majority of the Jewish race which was of historical importance as retaining and developing Jewish law and tradition. In the academies of Palestine and Babylonia, which, after the destruction of Jerusalem, became the foci of Jewish intellectual life, the Aramaic language was not slow in penetrating, and eventually became the medium of debates and lectures. The use of any tongue but Hebrew for prayer was for a time opposed, but in the end Aramaic was employed to a certain extent even for this purpose. For more than a thousand years Aramaic remained the vernacular of Israel until the conquest of the Arabs produced another linguistic change. By the beginning of the ninth century A. D., in districts where the Jews had previously spoken Aramaic, only Arabic-speaking Jews were to be found; Arabic, indeed, as the daily language of the Jews, now held sway throughout north Africa and Spain. Thenceforth Aramaic became in a certain measure a second holy tongue, next to Hebrew in the religious and literary life of the Jewish people. Especially to the Targum, or Aramaic version of the Scriptures, did the religious sentiment pay high regard, even after the work had ceased to be useful as a vernacular translation of the Hebrew original, and had itself come to require translation. The use of the Aramaic as a literary language was revived in the so-called Zohar, which became the most important text-book of the Cabala, the Bible of mystical speculation. Before leaving this topic we should note that, while the Palestinian Talmud and the Babylonian Talmud contain the most abundant and important remains of the Aramaic literature, neither of these compilations is entirely an Aramaic work. A large proportion of their materials is couched in the New Hebrew, which had undergone Aramaic influences.

III.

The relations of the Jews to the Arabs are expounded in everal articles respectively entitled "Arabia," "Arabic-Jewish Philosophy," "Arabic Language Among Jews," "Arabic Literature of the Jews" and "Arabic Philosophy—its Influence on Judaism." In connection with the three last-named articles, should be read the article by Dr. A. Loewenthal on "Aristotle in Jewish Literature."

In the article on "Arabic-Jewish Philosophy," Prof. Ludwig Stein, professor of philosophy at the University of Berne, attributes the cold and almost hostile attitude of Judaism toward philosophy to the fact that every religion based upon law is necessarily authoritative in its utterances. Other religious systems had to think out for themselves a foundation for the world; in Judaism one was ready to hand. An account of the origin of the universe was posited at the very beginning of the Hebrew Bible. Moreover, of all ancient religions, Judaism was the only optimistic one. Thus it came to pass that their faith sealed for the Jews all the sources of philosophy. The aversion of Judaism to philosophy is exemplified in the circumstance that, when Jewish Hellenism in Alexandria evolved, not only fitful stars of small magnitude, but also a great and enduring luminary in Philo, it was rudimentary Christianity that blossomed forth in response to the Jewish-Hellenic doctrine of the Logos: Judaism remained entirely uninfluenced by the Philonic philosophy. A proof of this lack of influence is that Maimonides—the sole Jewish philosopher of the Middle Ages who had a full appreciation of the historical sequence of his faith—knew as little of the existence of Philo as of the works of Josephus. According to Prof. Stein, all mediæval Judaism remained in ignorance of Philo, even Ibn Gabirol, whose relation to Plato was identical with Philo's, not suspecting the existence of the Alexandrian thinker.

In the article on "Aristotle in Jewish Literature," Dr. Loewenthal asserts that, although earlier Jewish thinkers were unquestionably acquainted with Aristotle's philosophy, Abraham ibn Daud (1160) was the first Jewish philosopher to acknowledge the supremacy of Aristotelianism. From his time until long after that of Maimonides, (1135-1204) Aristotelian philosophy occupied the foreground of Hebrew thought, only again to yield its position gradually to Platonism, under the growing influence of the Cabala. It is certain that, but for the services of the Jewish translators of Aristotle, the mental culture of the Western world could scarcely have taken the direction which it did take and certainly would not have proceeded at the rapid rate which was made possible through the agency of the Humanists and of the Renaissance. The Arabic-Jewish philosophers were the Humanists, the agents of culture, of the Middle Ages. They established and maintained a bond of union between the Arabic philosophers, physicians and poets on the one hand, and the Latin-Christian world on the other. Such Jewish thinkers and scholars as Gabirol, Maimonides and Crescas not only illumined those masters of Christian scholasticism Albertus Magnus and Thomas Aquinas, but their light has penetrated deeply into the philosophy of modern times. Leibnitz speaks with no little respect of Maimonides, as does Spinoza of Crescas. Dr. Loewenthal reminds us that the Arabic expounders of Aristotle leavened his views more and more with monotheism, and thus, through new interpretations and constructions, the heathen character of his philosophy was gradually refined away. With all the attempts, however, of Maimonides and of his successor, Levi ben Gerson, to harmonize Judaism and Aristotelianism, they could not fail to awaken in discerning minds the conviction that such endeavors started from wrong premises.

The extent to which Jews have contributed to Arabic literature will be found indicated in an article by Prof. H. Hirschfeld. A number of Arabic poems and prose works on the subject of belles-lettres are credited to Jewish authors. What will surprise many persons, no fewer than forty-five tales in the Arabic collection entitled "One Thousand and One Nights" have been traced to a Jewish editor of a Cairene edition, and M. V. Chauvin in a recent treatise has suggested that fifteen others were inserted, though not written by him. Among the Arabic tales attributed to Jewish authors are the "Story of Ali Cogia," the "Story of Abdallah," "Hassan of Bassorah" and "The Seventh Voyage of Sindbad." In the "Ensorcelled Prince," the Peri transforms fish of different colors into the former inhabitants of a city, the yellow fish being turned into Jews because the Jews of Egypt wore yellow badges, owing to the pact made with Caliph Omar. M. De Goeje has contended that the framework story of the "Arabian Nights," the story which makes the Queen Shahrazad avert her execution by telling tales for one thousand and one nights, is substantially identical with that of Esther.

IV.

The article on "Assyria" in this volume is by Dr. J. Frederic McCurdy, Professor of Oriental Languages in the University College, Toronto; and that on the relation of Assyriology to the Old Testament by Dr. I. M. Price, Professor of Semitic Languages and Literature in the University of Chicago. Dr. Price shows that, in the known cuneiform documents relating to Assyria, the names of ten kings of Israel and Judah have been identified. Thus we learn from one of these documents that, at the Battle of Karkar (854 B. C.), Shalmanezer II. had to face among other Western forces, "2,000 chariots and 10,000 men of Ahab of Israel." The Old Testament does not mention this battle, nor give any intimation of its disastrous results. The same Assyrian king, in his record of a campaign prosecuted twelve years later, says: "At that time I received the tribute of the Syrians, the Sidonians and of Jehu, the son of Omri." Prof. Price suggests that "Jehu, the son of Omri," was used in the sense of "successor" to Ahab on the throne of Israel.

In the latter half of the eighth century B. C., Tiglath-pileser III. recounts in an extant document: "Nineteen districts of the city of Hamath, together with the towns in their circuit, situated on the sea of the setting sun [the Mediterranean], which in their faithlessness had joined Azariah, I restored to the territory of the Land of Asshur." In another cuneiform fragment it is stated that this was "Azariah the Judean." In 732 B. C. the same Assyrian King captured Damascus and made Samaria feel his vengeance. One of the King's records says: "Pekah, their King, they overthrew; Hoshea I appointed over them." In a list of petty tributary Kings of the east coast of the Mediterranean Sea, Tiglath-pileser III. mentions Ahaz of Judah. The next definite statement relating to the Old Testament is found in the records of Sargon II., who is mentioned but once in the Old Testament. In the first year of his reign (722 B. C.), Sargon says: "The city Samaria I deceived; 27,290 of its inhabitants I carried away captive, but the remainder I allowed to retain their possessions." According to his own account, as well as that given in the Old Testament, the depopulated territory was repopulated by the importation of peoples from several foreign countries. This intermixture of strange races with Israelites belonging to the northern kingdom formed the basis of the later Samaritans. Sargon's son, Sennacherib, invaded Palestine in 701 B.C., and he has left a record of the campaign. He says that he overran the land of Judah, captured forty-six of its strong fortresses and carried off 200,150 captives. Sennacherib asserts that Hezekiah, King of Judah, sent tribute after him to Nineveh. No mention is made of any disaster. Although this Assyrian King reigned twenty years thereafter he records no further movement toward the West. Esar Haddon, who ruled from 681 to 668 B. C., mentions Manasseh of Judah in a list of twenty-two vassal Kings on the Mediterranean coast, and the next Assyrian sovereign, Assurbanipal, enumerates the same Jewish King in his list of vassals. With the fall of Nineveh, of course, the contact of Assyria with Judah came to a close.

The articles on Babylonia and the prolonged and important relation of the Jews to that country occupy some fourteen pages of this encyclopædia; they are contributed by Prof. R. W. Rogers of the Drew Theological Seminary and by Dr. S. Krauss, Professor in the Normal College at Budapest. After summing up what is known from the cuneiform inscriptions of the early history of the Euphrates Valley and of the territory between the Euphrates and the Tigris, Dr. Rogers directs attention to the references to this region in the Bible. He reminds us that in some passages of the Old Testament the land of Babylonia is called Shinar, while in the post-exilic literature it is called the Land of the Chaldeans. In the historical books of Israel Babylonia is frequently mentioned, though the lack of a clear distinction between the city and the country is sometimes puzzling. In the poetical literature of the Jews, Babylonia plays an insignificant part, but it fills a very large place in the Prophets. In the number and importance of its references to Babylonian life and history the Book of Jeremiah stands preëminent in Hebrew literature. But for this Hebrew document little would be known of Nebuchadnezzar's campaign against Jerusalem.

Dr. Krauss, in his article, points out that the earliest accounts of the Jews exiled to Babylonia are derived exclusively from the scanty details of the Bible. He does not regard as entirely trustworthy the sources from which an attempt has been made to supply the deficiency of information. Only this much he considers certain, namely, that the descendants of the Davidic house occupied an exalted position among the Jews dwelling in Mesopotamia. It was only after Alexander's conquest of the Persian Empire that accurate data concerning the Jews beyond the Euphrates reached the Western World. The Jews evidently contributed to Babylonia's foreign commerce, which in the post-Alexandrian epoch was centred in Seleucia and Ctesiphon. Devoted as they were to trade, however, the Jews in Babylonia did not shrink from handicrafts, and it is certain that there were farmers among them. The prosperity of the Jews in this region was attested by the handsome synagogues and colleges that they erected. "In view," says Dr. Krauss, "of the undoubted fact that the Jewish inhabitants of Babylonia were of purer racial extraction than the Jews of Palestine, the former considered themselves, especially after the fall of Jerusalem, as the genuine Israel, and their differing traditions and customs as of higher authority than those of the home country. It is well known that the Babylonian Talmud became the dominant authority for modern Judaism."

In the protracted struggle between the Parthians and the Romans, the Jews of Babylonia naturally sided with the former, their protectors. It is said that the Parthian kings elevated the princes of the Exile, who, till then, had been little more than mere collectors of revenue, to the dignity of real princes. The Babylonian Jews were by no means so well treated under the Sassanid monarchs, by whom the old religion of the Magi was revived. Nevertheless they were better off as a rule under the Sassanid kings than they were after the conquest of Persia by the Moslems, when the brilliant era of the Jews in Babylonia came to an end. After rabbinical academies were founded in Alexandria, Kairwan, Cordova, and perhaps, Narboone, Babylonia lost its central importance for Judaism. The last *gaon*, or head of the Babylonian Academy at Sura, died in 1034 A. D. The Exilarchate had to be suspended about 940 A. D., but it must have been revived later, for there seems to have been an Exilarch in or near Bagdad in 1139 A. D. Benjamin of Tudela toward the end of the twelfth century found 7,000 Jews in Mosul on the Tigris, opposite ancient Nineveh, and at their head was a descendant of David. About the same time another traveller, Pethahiah, records that the Jews in Babylonia lived in peace, and that the Caliph demanded no taxes from them. The Mongol destroyers of the Bagdad Caliphate showed themselves tolerant toward both Jews and Christians, and exempted the priests of all religions from the poll tax. The Jews of Mesopotamia passed under the control of the Ottoman Sultans in 1534 A. D., and but little trustworthy information concerning them during the subsequent centuries is obtainable.

V.

The article on "Astronomy" is by Mr. Joseph Jacobs, formerly President of the Jewish Historical Society of England; and that on "Astrology," by Dr. K. Kohler, Rabbi of Temple Beth-El, New York. After noting that the Talmud subscribes to the geocentric conception of the universe, Mr. Jacobs recall that as late as 1714 the Jewish astronomer David Nieto of London still held out against the Copernican system. No claim is made that the Jews in ancient times or during the Middle Ages made any important contributions to the science of astronomy. On the other hand almost all the tables used by astronomers and navigators were their work, and they introduced several improvements in astronomical instruments. Abraham Zacuto ben Samuel was Professor of Astronomy at Salamanca, and afterward Astronomer Royal to Emanuel of Portugal, who previously had been advised by a Jewish astronomer, Rabbi Joseph Vecinho, a pupil of Zacuto, as to the project of discovery put before him by Columbus, who, in carrying out the project, made use of Zacuto's "Almanac" and "Tables." The most recent epoch of astronomy begins with a great Jewish name, that of Sir William Herschel, whose Jewish origin is acknowledged by his biographer. His discovery of the planet Uranus, his catalogues of nebulæ and clusters and his systematic survey of the heavens, completed by his son John, deserve to be classed by Mr. Jacobs among the great exploits in the history of astronomy. Since Herschel's time no very memorable service has been rendered to astronomical science by a Jew, though no less than fourteen asteroids were located by H. Goldschmidt (1802-66)—at a time when the discovery of an asteroid was by no means so easy a task as it now is; while W. Beer (1797-1850), the brother of Meyerbeer, was the first to draw an accurate map of the moon. We add that the present director of the Paris Observatory is a Jew, namely, Moritz Loewy, the inventor of the *coudé*, or elbow, telescope, by which the stars may be observed without bending the neck back, and without leaving the observatory.

Dr. Kaufmann Kohler, the author of the article on astrology, asserts that there were no Jewish astrologers, either in the Holy Land or in Babylonia, and that the art, together with those who practised it, was condemned, although the reality of a science of the stars was as little questioned by the Jews as by the rest of the world up to the seventeenth century. The parables of the Talmud bear witness to the prevalence of the belief in astrology among the Jews. Thus we are told in the Talmud that Jethro advised Moses to select the men whom he wished to coöperate with him "by means of the mirror into which the Kings are accustomed to gaze." Again, we read "a ruler sentenced a man to death by fire; but, when he perceived by means of astrology that the condemned man would beget a daughter destined to become the King's wife, he said, 'this man must be saved for his daughter's sake.'" According to the Talmud, it was due to the art of astrology that the wife of Potiphar learned that she was to have a son by Joseph; and it was for this reason that she regarded him with favor. It was an error, however, for the prognostication referred to her daughter, who subsequently became Joseph's wife. Notwithstanding such proofs of the prevalence of belief in astrological science, there was but one teacher of the Talmud, Samuel of Babylonia (about A. D. 250) who became an adept in astrology, and even he says, "Torah cannot go together with the art that studies the heavens." A form of astrological superstition which long persisted among the Jews, and still survives among uncultured peoples, is the selection of propitious days. On Joshua ben Levi's "tablets" (third century A. D.) it is stated that men born on Sunday will be distinguished, on Monday prone to anger, on Tuesday rich and sensual, on Wednesday intelligent and enlightened, on Thursday benevolent and on Friday pious, while those born on Saturday are destined to die on that day.

Throughout the middle ages the art of star-gazing, or prognostication, was practised by Jews. Coming from the East as they did, they were looked upon as heirs of the Chaldeans, and, probably for this reason, were regarded by the Occidental world as experts in astrology. A thorough knowledge of astrology is exhibited in the Cabala, and Dr. Kohler gives a long list of mediæval Jewish astrologers. Maimonides was the only high Jewish authority in the Middle Ages that opposed astrology energetically. In spite of the references to it in the Talmud, he denounced it as "a disease, not a science, a tree under the shadow of which all sorts of superstitions thrive, and which must be uprooted in order to give way to the tree of knowledge and the tree of life." Even now, however, although modern science has abolished astrology, a survival of the old belief may be traced in the Jewish custom of rejecting certain days in the week or the month for weddings or new ventures.

VI.

We have grouped together for notice the articles headed "Aragon," "Arianism" and "Barcelona," because, taken collectively, they throw considerable light on the position of the Jews in Spain during the first fifteen centuries of the Christian era. It is well known that, in contrast with the orthodox Church the Arian was distinguished by tolerance and by mild treatment of the adherents of other sects. Dr. S. Krauss, the author of the article on "Arianism," thinks that the superior tolerance of that form of Christianity is traceable in some degree to certain points of agreement between the Arian doctrine and Judaism. For example, the insistence upon the subordinate relationship of the Son to the God-father is much nearer to the Jewish doctrine of the Messiah than it is to the conception of the full divinity of the Son enunciated by the Nicene Council. It is certain that, as long as the Visigothic Kings of Spain remained Arian, the Jews were well treated in the Iberian Peninsula, and became an important element of the urban population. They formed in the Visigothic realm a distinct nation, enumerated in official documents by the side of the Goths, Romans, Greeks and Syrians; as such, they were in the main upon exactly the same footing as the others.

Indeed, the ruling Visigoths, so long as they adhered to Arianism, may have preferred the Jews to the Catholics, for the latter were politically Roman, and likely, therefore, to side with the Byzantine Emperors in their endeavors to recover ascendency in the West. There is evidence that marriages between Arian Christians and Jews were not infrequent, and it has even been asserted that the Jews at one time and in certain parts of Spain, exercised some sort of jurisdiction over the Catholics. On the other hand, the laws of the Visigoths, formulated under Reccared (A. D. 584) and his successors, after the Visigothic Kings and the nobles had become converted to Catholic Christianity, give evidence of a most rancorous feeling against the Jews; and the enactments for the persecution of Israel present a striking contrast to the former happy circumstances of the Jews in the Visigothic realm. There is reason to believe that the bitter hostility provoked among the Jews by the persecution which they suffered after the Visigothic Kings had adopted the Athanasian creed, accounts for the otherwise inexplicable rapidity of the conquests of Spain by the Arabs and Moors, most of the fortified cities in which the Jews were numerous and powerful being surrendered without a blow.

The article on "Aragon" is written by Dr. Moritz Kayserling of Budapest, the author of "A History of the Jews in Portugal." So long as the rule of the Moors lasted in the province of Aragon—it did not end until A. D. 1118—the Jews were free from persecution and extortion. For about two centuries thereafter the industry, wealth and learning of the Aragonese Jews secured for them the protection and favor of their Christian sovereigns. Don Pedro II. of Aragon mortgaged to his Jewish subjects the greater portion of his possessions and revenues. Under Pedro's son and successor Jaime I., surnamed "el Conquistador," the political and legal question of the Jews in Aragon was an enviable one. Jaime I. issued the following decree: "All Jews and Saracens dwelling in our domains belong to the King, and are, with all their possessions, under the King's especial protection." No Jew could become a bondman to any nobleman; nor could Jews be called serfs, even of the King, because, according to the law, they had full liberty of movement, except that they could not change the city of their abode without the King's permission. They were allowed to take four denarii per pound as weekly interest for money lent (about 86 per cent per annum). Frequently, however, the King would release all debtors of the Jews from their obligations, and declare the debt void. Under Jaime I. Jews not only owned houses and estates, and were permitted to follow agriculture and trades, and even to farm the royal grist mills, but many honorable administrative posts were open to them. When Jaime conquered Majorca, he was attended by an Israelite private secretary; another Jew was head bailiff and royal treasurer of Aragon; other Jews were bailiffs in Saragossa and Barcelona. Pope Clement IV. in vain requested Jaime to remove Jews from all public offices. But Jaime's son, Pedro III., so far yielded to the stormy demands of his Christian subjects as to decree that no Jew should thenceforth occupy the position of bailiff.

The great persecution of the Jews in 1391, which began in Seville, spread to the northeast of the peninsula, and severely affected the Jews of Aragon and Catalonia. Entire communities, such as those of Valencia, Lerida and Barcelona, were wiped out; thousands of Jews were slain, and 100,000 were forced nominally to embrace Christianity. The large number of pseudo-Christians, or Maranos, was materially increased twenty years later. The rich Marano families of Saragossa and other Aragonese cities attained influential positions in the Cortes, in public life and at the Court of King Juan II., and often intermarried with aristocratic families, and even with the Infantas. The Jews of Aragon who remained faithful to their religion, however, were very harshly treated during the last century of their sojourn in the province. After the death of Juan II. in 1479, Aragon passed under the rule of Ferdinand, who married Isabella of Castille, and thenceforward, the history of the Jews of Aragon was practically indistinguishable from that of all the other Jews of Spain.

Dr. Moritz Kayserling, who is also the author of the article on "Barcelona," recalls that Judah, the favorite of Charles the Bald, settled in the Catalonian capital, his arrival being announced to the inhabitants by a letter from the King's own hand. In the time of Count Ramon Berenguer I. (1035-65) the Jews of Barcelona were already landowners. Among them is mentioned a certain Reuben who had an estate at the foot of Monjuich. This mountain, which is near the sea, and is also called "Mons Judaicus," (Monjuich) was used as early as the middle of the tenth century A. D. as a cemetery for the Jews. Barcelona early grew to be one of the most important mercantile centres of Europe, and its commercial code became the foundation of modern maritime law.

The part taken by the Jews in the expansion of the city has not been fully worked out, but it is indicated by a succession of important Jewish financiers. An Arab historian called the Jewish community of Barcelona "a community of princes and aristocrats." It is certain that the Jews of Barcelona paid in direct taxes more than half of all that was paid by the Jewish communities of Aragon. For a long time the Jews of the Catalonian capital continued on good terms with the Christian inhabitants of the city. In A. D. 1237, a Jew was Bayle, or Mayor. The friendly relationship ceased with the growing influence of the priesthood. In 1348 the mob plundered Jewish houses and killed a score of the inhabitants, but the nobles and prominent citizens espoused the Jewish cause, and dispersed the rioters. In 1391, however, during the great persecution which began at Seville, to which we have referred, the Jewish community of Barcelona was annihilated. No promises could induce the Jews to settle again in the city. Even now, although there are in Barcelona a certain number of Jews from France, Germany and the United States, they do not form a community, and have not erected a house of prayer.

VII.

The article headed "Auto da Fé," the name given in Portuguese to the public announcement of the guilt or innocence of a person accused before the Inquisition, which was followed in case of conviction by the punishment of the condemned, is contributed by Prof. R. Gottheil. It seems that the earliest record of the burning of Jews at an auto da fé relates to that held in Troyes on April 24, 1288. The execution called forth strenuous protests from King Philip the Fair. Most of the information concerning the relations of the Inquisition to Jews refers to Spain, Portugal and their colonies, although there is no doubt that Jews suffered at the hands of the tribunal in Italy, and especially in Venice, during the sixteenth century. In Spain autos were held from A. D. 1480, and in Portugal after 1531. The Holy Office was established in America in 1569. The last auto held in Portugal took place at Lisbon in 1739, but as lately as Aug. 1, 1826, an auto was celebrated at Valencia in which one Jew was burned alive. It should be remembered that the custom was that the penitents were first strangled and then burned, while the impenitents, or those who refused to renounce their religion, were cast into the flames alive. Prof. Gottheil finds it impossible to compute the number of Jews who met their death at the many autos da fé in Spain and Portugal, but it is known that many thousands perished by burning. A list has been compiled by Adler of 6,448 Jewish victims of the Inquisition, the names and fates of whom can be ascertained from the "Relaciones" of only 115 out of 464 autos da fé which are known to have taken place between 1481 and 1826.

VIII.

There have been great Jewish musicians—Mendelssohn, Meyerbeer and Halévy, for example. There have been great Jewish poets—for instance Heine. Why have there never been great painters and sculptors among the Jews? This question prompts us to examine with peculiar interest the articles on the "Attitude of Judaism Toward Art," and on "The Beautiful in Jewish Literature." They are contributed by Prof. Immanuel Benzinger of Berlin University, by Dr. Kaufmann Kohler and Mr. J. E. Eisenstein of New York and by Prof. E. G. Hirsch of the University of Chicago. According to Prof. Benzinger, it was the religion of the Jews that precluded the full development of the art of sculpture, and confined it within narrow limits. In the most ancient times, when graven images were not as yet proscribed, the technical ability to make them artistically was lacking; and, when, in later periods, the requisite artistic skill might have been acquired from others, images were forbidden. The persistent fight of the Prophets against images was waged with such success that, in the end, not only was any representation of the Deity forbidden, but even the portraiture of living beings in general, man or beast. Such a command as that of the Decalogue would have been impossible to a nation possessed of such artistic gifts as were the Greeks, and was carried to its ultimate consequences—as to-day in Islam—only because the people lacked artistic inclination, with its creative power and formative imagination. The glyptic art was practised among the Hebrew in remote antiquity. They seemed to have been taught how to engrave on precious stones by the Canaanites, who, in their turn, had received the art from the Phœnicians. The Hebrew and Phœnician seals resemble each other very closely in shape, script and ornamentation. The ornaments include devices of Phœnician origin, such as the palm leaf, a garland of poppy-heads, or pomegranates, winged spheres, etc.; and there are also Egyptian devices, such as Hathor's insignia and the eye of Osiris. Of metal work among the ancient Jews there are no remains extant. Sculpture in stone hardly existed at all among them. Ivory and wood carving, on the other hand, were practised by them from ancient times.

The development of painting, as well as of sculpture, was obstructed among the Jews by their religion, to which, according to Benzinger and Delitzsch, should be added a defective sense of color. Attempts in the direction of painting, however, are found in the earliest times in the custom of decorating with colors jars, vases and articles of a similar character. In every case, however, the painting amounts to but a simple form of ornamentation by means of colored lines, in which geometrical figures predominate, with parallel lines and lines at right angles, zigzag and waving lines, all forming a sort of band around the neck or body of the vessel. Prof. Benzinger asserts that in the Old Testament painting is not mentioned: He holds that, when Ezekiel speaks of "men portrayed upon the wall the images of the Chaldeans portrayed with mermillion," it is not painting proper that is referred to, but probably outline drawings with a colored pencil, the contours being then filled in with color.

Dr. Kohler tells us that after the Talmud exercised authority, more rational rules were followed in interpreting the law prohibiting images. In view of the fact that, as a rule, only carved figures or statues were objects of worship, the prohibition of the Decalogue was not applied to images not projected. It was held that portrait painting was not forbidden by the law. As a matter of fact, however, the spirit of the Jewish faith was far more potent than the law in putting a check upon pictorial as well as upon plastic art. The same spirit would deter the mediæval Jew from imitating the paintings of Jesus and the Virgin, of the Apostles and the saints, which, in the Christian Church, tended, in his eyes, to produce a relapse into Pagan idolatry. Nevertheless, painting was practised to a certain extent among the Jews of the Middle Ages.

While it was a rule not to decorate the walls of the synagogues with figures, lest the devotion of the worshipper should be distracted by the sight, the doors of the synagogue and the Ark were frequently ornamented with representations of animals (among which the lion was a favorite subject), occasionally, also, of birds and snakes and of plants, such as flowers and vines. In all cases where fear of idolatrous worship by non-Jews was excluded, liberal-minded rabbis saw no reason for prohibiting such ornamentation, whereas rigorists would discourage it altogether. Of home utensils, cups and lamps used for Sabbath and festival days were occasionally, in the Middle Ages, despite the adverse opinion of rabbinical authorities, embossed with figured designs. Platters, painted and inlaid, table covers, embroidered with golden birds and fishes; wooden vessels, edged and figured, were in common use. The walls of the houses of the rich were sometimes decorated with paintings of Old Testament scenes, and on the outside secular objects were portrayed. Portrait painting, though not common, was not unknown among the Jews of Germany in the eighteenth century, while in Italy it existed as early as the fifteenth. Especially was the illumination of manuscripts and the artistic binding of books carried to great proficiency by Jews, who probably acquired the art from the monks. According to Lecky, many of the goldsmiths of Venice who cultivated the art of carving were Jews. Of recent years greater attention has been paid to the subject of Jewish ecclesiastical art, especially since the Anglo-Jewish historical exhibition of 1887.

Prof. E. G. Hirsch, the author of the interesting article on "The Beautiful in Jewish Literature," concedes that the Jews cannot be said to have contributed fruitful thoughts to the speculative theory of the beautiful. That field fell to the inheritance of the Greeks, though it is deemed probable that their impulses in this domain were received from the Assyrian civilization. Prof. Hirsch accepts Renan's distinction that, while beauty was the preoccupation of the Greek soul, righteousness is that of the Hebrew. He points out, however, that one might find in the Jewish Aristotelians—notably Maimonides—indications of an appreciation of the beautiful; and he insists that the absolute denial to the Jewish mind of the capacity to appreciate and realize the beautiful should be relegated to the lumber room of prejudice. The vocabulary of Judaism does not lack terms connoting the beauty of the body as well as that of the soul. It is certain that the art of ornamenting the body was highly developed among the Jews at a comparatively early period. The third chapter of Isaiah shows that the boudoir of the Hebrew woman was well provided with the things she deemed needful to enhance her charms. Even during and after the Maccabean struggle, when a violent reaction set in against Greek customs, including the culture of the body, there is abundant evidence that physical beauty, both in men and women, was regarded as a distinction, to gain which was worthy of the ambition of the best. Nor did the art of heightening the natural comeliness of man or woman fall into disuse during the Talmudic era. Fondness for bathing was made the subject of special note in the case of no less personage than Hillel. The use of ointments; the attention paid to the toilet of the bride on her day of joy; the ornaments which are deemed indispensable to woman; the recorded use of artificial cosmetics to beautify the eyebrows or the finger nails; the fondness ascribed to women for fine garments and fine surroundings, in preference even to luxurious food—these and many similar details, scattered throughout Talmudic literature, go far to disprove the popular assumption that there was a lack of appreciation for physical beauty among the Jews. "Woman's attractiveness is her beauty," said the fair maidens of Jerusalem at their gatherings on the hills on the 15th of Ab, and at the close of the Day of Atonement. In fact, according to Prof. Hirsch, the Jews had a standard of personal beauty which was largely their own.

The acrostic praise of the good housewife's virtues in Proverbs throws some light on the peculiar disposition of the Jewish mind in this field. Still more telling are the descriptive adjectives and similes of the Songs of Solomon. Dr. Hirsch holds that there is good reason for saying that, in the estimation of the Jews, during both the Biblical period and that of the Palestinian Talmudists, physical beauty conformed to the requirements which we know from the "Arabian Nights" were considered indispensable by the Arabs. We learn that in connection with the Rabbinical amplification of Sarah's adventure in Egypt, it is stated that, in accordance with the Shulamite's words in the Song of Songs, black or dark complexion was considered to detract from beauty. The hair worn high and coiled back was regarded as an effective device to increase personal attractiveness, while the eyes of the bride, if sparkling and soft, were held to be sufficient and to free her from the necessity of resorting to other ornaments. One of the ways to allure a would-be suitor and to inflame his passion was to plait the hair. Child-bearing was known to be detrimental to the comeliness of the body. The matriarchs—Sarah for example—preserved their beauty so long because they long remained childless. The desire to have beautiful children was keen among the women of Israel, and various devices have been recorded as having been employed by them to accomplish this end. Rabbi Johanan ben Nappaha, renowned for his long and flowing beard, was so deeply impressed with his own beauty that he used to sit for hours by the portals of the bathing establishments in order to impress the women with his appearance and thus influence the looks of their expected offspring.

With a reference to the assertion that the Jews are destitute of a sense of the beauties of nature, Prof. Hirsch submits that this very feeling is evinced in almost every line of the Psalms, while the descriptions in the Book of Job, and many graphic similes in the writings of the Prophets challenge comparison with the best produced by the Homeric poets. It is acknowledged, however, that the Jewish sense of the beauties of nature differs from that of the Greeks, in so far as it responds rather to the majestic totality of the universe than to the charm of details. It is not the individual star, nor the particularized flower, nor the local sunset that inspires the Hebrew singer to articulation; it is rather the heavens considered as the throne of God, the mountains, regarded as melting under the touch of His will, the earth beheld in the throes of a God-ordained destiny, and similar general appreciation of the sublime and exalted aspects of God's handiwork that impel the Jewish bard to sing. At the same time, Homer's description of the bee tribe may be paralleled by that of the ant in the Proverbs.

Prof. Hirsch expresses a doubt whether in architecture the Jews can be credited with inventive genius. The Bible seems to indicate that, whatever of the building art they had they had derived from their neighbors, the Phœnicians. We observe that the present volume of the Encyclopædia, where we should naturally look for it, contains no article on Jewish architecture. We are referred to the articles entitled "Almemar" and "Jewish Architecture in America" in the first volume of this work, and to various articles which will appear in succeeding volumes, especially to those on ancient and modern synagogues.

M. W. H.